REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated February 13, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on May 13, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed herein.

Claims 10, 14, 16, 17, 27, 40-46, 48, and 50-55 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 14, 17, 27, and 40-46 stand objected to and claims 48, and 50-55 are indicated to be allowable by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Paragraph [0028] is objected to since to vaporize steam to form a cooling zone appears inaccurate since steam, by definition, is vapor and its condensate provides cooling.

Applicant has amended paragraph [0028] to clarify the "cooling" description. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 10 and 40-46 stand objected to because of informalities in the claims.

Applicant has amended claim 10 and 16 to overcome the Examiner's objection. Also, claims 40 and 43 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10 and 16, as best understood by the Examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Butler* (U.S. 5,607,016) in view of *Ayasse, et al.* (U.S. 6,412,557).

Butler discloses recovering hydrocarbons by injecting a liquid vaporizable hydrocarbon solvent and a displacement gas into the reservoir to mobilize the hydrocarbon. *Butler* also discloses positioning a pump at an incline portion of the wellbore. However, *Butler* does not teach the position of the pump in relation to a cooling zone formed by the hydrocarbon solvent. Just because the pump is at an incline portion does not equate to a position above the cooling zone. In addition, *Butler* defines the solvent as "a hydrocarbon...." (See col. 5, lns. 2-6). Thus, *Butler* specifically excluded steam from being a solvent. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to substitute steam for the solvent, as suggested by the Examiner. Moreover, *Ayasse* teaches a catalyst process for upgrading oil. *Ayasse* discloses that the process may be applied to any process where gases are injected to reduce the viscosity of oil, for example, steam injection and hydrocarbon solvent gases. However, this statement does not mean that steam and hydrocarbon solvent gases are interchangeable. *Ayasse* is only stating that its process is suitable for either application, not that the two applications are interchangeable. The references, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest cooling at least a portion of the well fluids at and adjacent the cooling zone in the tubular, and positioning a pump on the lower surface of the footed portion above the cooling zone and in a portion of well fluids containing a mixture of gas phase and liquid phase fluids, wherein the pump has a width smaller than the span and a gap exists between the pump and the borehole upper surface, as recited in claim 10. Therefore, Applicant believes the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the same.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason C. Huang
Registration No. 46,222
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants